

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 939

UD 016 298

AUTHOR Goldberg, Gertrude S.
TITLE Class Action, Community Organization, and School Reform. Aspira of New York, Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization and Harlem Parents Union.
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Inst. for Urban and Minority Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 13p.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y. 10027 (1-9 copies, \$1.00 each; quantity discounts available)
JOURNAL CIT IRCD Bulletin, v11 n2 p1-12 Spr 1976
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Role; Change Strategies; Community Development; Community Involvement; Community Organizations; Court Litigation; Disadvantaged Youth; *Economically Disadvantaged; *Educational Change; *Educational Opportunities; Legal Problems; *Minority Group Children; Parent Participation; *Private Agencies
IDENTIFIERS Aspira Incorporated; Harlem Parents Union; Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization

ABSTRACT

This report on educational reform shows how three dynamic but quite different organizations are currently attempting to secure quality education for urban disadvantaged children. Aspira of New York, Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization, and Harlem Parents Union are three self-help groups that seek quality education for poor children but differ as to leadership, constituencies, and strategies. Whether these organizations are calling for bilingual instruction, compensatory programs, or educational vouchers, they want to improve children's basic cognitive skills; and they are pressing for school reforms because they feel that economic success depends upon better basic education. Their current school strategies are not integrationist. Finally, although they continue to engage in community organization, they also are taking legal action to secure quality education. This report indicates that positive action, the implementation of a court order, may require more organizational resources than initiating a suit and getting the court to agree that school officials have violated the law. If the children of the poor are to have quality education, they will need advocates outside the ghetto, but they will also need an organized community.

(Author/JM)

IRCD Bulletin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION



THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Publication of the
Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

Volume XI, Number 2

Spring 1976

Class Action, Community Organization, and School Reform

Aspira of New York, Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization
and Harlem Parents Union

Gertrude S. Goldberg

However disillusioned they are with the educational establishment, educational action groups retain an almost pristine faith in the value of education. Their belief in the American educational creed seems unshaken by the philosophers, historians, and sociologists who have questioned the relationship of educational attainment to social mobility or doubted the relevance of schooling to postindustrial society. School activists recognize that quality education is not a panacea for social problems, but they continue to regard it as a necessary first step toward social mobility.

"The strategies may have changed over the last twenty years," says Annie Stein, a close observer of the school scene, "but the goals have always been the same." The persisting objective of school activists, whether they urge integration, decentralization, community control, or some other strategy, is quality education. And above all, quality education for poor children implies teaching them the traditional triple Rs with better-than-traditional results. In short, those who want the disadvantaged to be better schooled seem more interested in the triple Rs than in the Triple Revolution.¹*

In this impressionistic report on educational reform I will show how three dynamic, but quite different, organizations are currently attempting to secure quality education for urban disadvantaged children. Whether these organizations are calling

for bilingual instruction, compensatory programs, or educational vouchers, they want to improve children's basic cognitive skills. And they are pressing for school reforms because they feel that economic success depends upon better basic education. Although these organizations want the attainments of minorities to be closer to those of the dominant white majority, their current school strategies are not integrationist. Finally, although they continue to engage in community organization, they also are taking legal action to secure quality education.

Three Dynamic Self-Help Organizations

Aspira of New York, Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization, (PWRO), and Harlem Parents Union are three self-help groups that seek quality education for poor children but differ as to leadership, constituencies, and strategies. Aspira is directed by Puerto Rican professionals, while the other two groups are headed by blacks. PWRO is ghetto grass roots. The members and leaders of Harlem Parents Union live in the black ghetto, but its officers are seasoned school activists who also run the organization's federally funded tutorial program. New York Aspira and Philadelphia Welfare Rights are still pressing the New York and Philadelphia school boards to develop programs to teach minority children effectively. The Parents Union ultimately hopes to get good public education for blacks and Hispanics; the union's strategists, however, feel that it is necessary to administer a severe shock to the school system by establishing a competing, alternative form of education that would be financed by tuition vouchers.

Aspira, PWRO, and Harlem Parents Union are not necessarily typical of all self-help groups engaged in the quest

Gertrude S. Goldberg, Ph.D., is Senior Research Associate at the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, and is a member of the faculty of the School of Social Work, Adelphi University.

*See end of article for Notes.

for quality education. Rather, they are among the most dynamic and successful of the school protest groups I have encountered. Each of the organizations is employing legal action to secure quality education, but all three depart from the prevailing post-1954 pattern because they are using the courts to achieve school reforms other than integration. Moreover, in the case of two of the groups, PWRO and Aspira, complicated and protracted litigation has achieved educational changes that were not gained through prior political action. Thus, at a time when many school activists are finding it hard to influence school policies, an analysis of the two organizations' difficult but successful encounters is not only encouraging but instructive. For it can teach us something about the components of class action, especially the requisite professional and organizational resources; and it also suggests that although the groups' school strategies lack the universalistic appeal of integration, they are less likely to exercise the majority.

The work of the Harlem Parents Union is also significant, but for somewhat different reasons. Despite several severe setbacks, the experienced strategists of this organization remain resilient and resolved to get a better education for their children. More than a decade ago, these activists were among the architects of the movement for community control of the public schools. In attempting to operationalize the long-discussed voucher plan through legal action, Harlem parent leaders are once again in the vanguard of school reform.

PWRO: "Welfare a Right; Education a Must"

The Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization engages in the struggle for better schools because it regards education as a way of freeing future generations from welfare dependency. PWRO people feel that they have a right to adequate, dignified public assistance, but even though they fight militantly for their rights as welfare recipients, they prefer economic independence, particularly for their children. Viola Sanders, the leader who sparked PWRO's successful school fight, puts it this way: "If our children are not going to go through the same thing we did, they are going to have an education." Hence the slogan of the PWRO Education Committee: "Welfare a Right; Education a Must."

PWRO efforts to secure better schooling focus on implementation of a federal law, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.² As Viola Sanders explains to PWRO constituents, "Title I is a small, but important avenue that we can use as parents to secure quality education for all poor and educationally disadvantaged students."³ Yet, when PWRO took a look at how Title I programs were operating in Philadelphia, it found that funds were not being sufficiently concentrated on children who suffer severe educational deprivation and that not enough money was being used to teach math and reading to these pupils. PWRO not only proved in court that Title I funds were being misused in Philadelphia, but after a protracted struggle, succeeded in forcing a big city school system to develop programs that comply with the law.

Parent Advisory Groups

Before turning to the courts in its battle to achieve its Title I ob-

jectives, however, PWRO tried first to take advantage of the vehicle for parent participation established by Title I itself. Aware that the Philadelphia school board had failed to establish the mandated Title I parent advisory council, PWRO called upon school officials to comply with this aspect of the law. Such a council was appointed, but it consisted primarily of parents who deferred to school authorities. Only two members were from PWRO, the organization that had shown the greatest interest in how Title I funds were being used in Philadelphia.

PWRO clearly lost its bid to participate in the Title I advisory council, but such bodies, as PWRO later acknowledged, have "no real power."⁴ Although school boards in some other cities have responded to community pressure by approving clothing allowances for Title I children or by funding bilingual programs, parent objectives may have been achieved because school personnel were basically amenable to their requests—not because advisory councils have power or parent pressure is persuasive. In Providence, for example, the chairman of the Title I Advisory Committee clearly differed from the pro-school board "patsies" in Philadelphia. Yet, despite her claim that "there isn't anything they can do to shut me up," a lawyer in Providence maintains that "legal action is the one useful kind of pressure that is at the disposal of the community."⁵ Barred even from an advisory role in relation to Title I programs, PWRO turned from pure political action to a combination of legal and organizational strategies.

The Substance of PWRO's School Suit

In the summer of 1973, the Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization, along with a group of low-income parents, sued the Pennsylvania State Department of Education.⁶ As plaintiffs in this class action suit, they were acting on behalf of their own and other educationally deprived low-income children. They charged that the defendants had approved Title I applications from the School District of Philadelphia, despite the fact that Philadelphia schools were violating statutory restrictions concerning the use of Title I funds.

The plaintiffs held that the Title I applications of the Philadelphia school system failed to comply with federal regulations pertaining to *comparability*, *supplantation*, *concentration*, and *evaluation*. The first two are attempts by the federal government to maintain state and local fiscal efforts, while the latter two try to assure that the designated beneficiaries will be served with maximum success. The federal rules state that a district must determine whether schools receiving Title I funds are *comparable* in certain important respects to schools not receiving these monies—for example, the average number of pupils per assigned certified classroom teacher. A local school system must also determine whether Title I monies supplement state and local funds and must deny application if federal money would *supplant* such funds. Title I programs must be *concentrated* in several ways: in schools with the highest percentage of low-income families, on educationally deprived children who have the greatest need for assistance, and on a limited number of projects, sufficient in size and scope to give promise of significant gains. Finally Title I projects must be *evaluated* annually to determine by

objective measurement their effect on school achievement.

In August 1973, Federal Court Judge Joseph S. Lord, III, upheld PWRO's allegations that the School District of Philadelphia failed to comply with the four Title I regulations explained above. He concurred that Pennsylvania state school officials had failed to make the necessary determinations concerning comparability, supplantation, and concentration, and that Philadelphia's Title I programs violated all three, as well as requirements for evaluation. Indeed, the judge doubted whether the defendants seriously contested the charges of PWRO and the other plaintiffs, since state attorneys responded without citing as authority a single case, statute, or regulation. Accordingly, Judge Lord granted the plaintiffs' request for an injunction prohibiting the state education department from approving Philadelphia's future Title I applications unless these complied with the four regulations that had been violated.

Resources for Educational Reform

PWRO's successful school action for poor children stemmed partly from the organization's strength as a grass-roots group and partly from resources that originated outside the ghetto. PWRO is an independent, persistent organization with a dedicated, highly effective leadership. Its educational victory would have been unthinkable without these organizational assets, but like most recent gains for the poor, PWRO's achievement owed something to federal grants-in-aid. Title I is itself an act of Congress, one that was not achieving its legislative purposes in Philadelphia. In order to make that law a genuine opportunity for poor people, PWRO took advantage of legal aid provided by another federal program, the Legal Services Corporation of the Office of Economic Opportunity.⁷

Lawyers were not the only professionals who contributed to PWRO's school action. Steve Gold, the lawyer who represents PWRO in education matters, points out that proving the case on comparability required some highly technical computer analysis by computer experts and social scientists who gave PWRO the equivalent of three week's time. In my discussion, however, I will emphasize the legal aid that PWRO got. I will also emphasize the role of professional educators who served on a court-appointed Title I Evaluation and Review Committee and played a key part in implementing the August 1973 court order.

PWRO strengths. Perhaps the outstanding trait of PWRO is independence. Its leaders take positions on controversial social issues without regard to the stands that other groups take. Viola Sanders says that with the possible exception of another action group, the Gray Panthers, "Welfare Rights is the only free muscle around." Declares the PWRO leader, "We will say what has to be said." And although PWRO eventually got some endorsements from other organizations, Ms. Sanders maintains that it was virtually alone when it began the Title I fight. "After four years PWRO got its consent decree, and then," she observes with the pique of those who start early and alone, "others were saying, 'We support you.'"

The Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization is doing the kind of community action some social workers dreamed

about in the sixties. By ten in the morning, its tenement office on Philadelphia's North Side is filled with people of all ages seeking help with housing, school, welfare, or police problems. In addition to providing these case services to between fifty and seventy-five clients a day, PWRO has accomplished reforms other than its Title I victory. With the help of the middle-class Friends of Welfare Rights, who threatened to close their department store accounts, PWRO waged a winning fight against door-to-door salesmen by getting downtown department stores to let people on welfare charge up to \$50 worth of purchases. And its chairwoman, Louise Brookins, is now organizing the unemployed and dependent in Pennsylvania's predominantly white rural counties. PWRO does all this with a cadre of volunteer welfare mothers and one paid worker, an office manager.

Lawyers for the poor. Inasmuch as legal pressure is the most potent weapon for community groups attempting to influence Title I decisions, PWRO needed access to substantial amounts of free legal counsel to achieve its Title I victory. The combination of legal aid and a courageous client organization contributed to successful class action.

Attorneys on the staff of Philadelphia's Community Legal Services have represented PWRO in its Title I action since 1972. The legal process has not only included the complicated, highly technical, and perhaps unprecedented work on the original suit in which PWRO lawyers compiled over a thousand pages of documents to prove that Philadelphia Title I programs were violating federal statutory requirements. It has also involved subsequent, protracted efforts to compel the school authorities to implement the 1973 court order. As Steve Gold says, "After winning, then the problems began."

In a recent interview Gold described the "relationship between lawyer and a client in a long term struggle." Once an employee of the school system, Gold has the greatest admiration for his clients, particularly Viola Sanders who he says, "ought to be president of the Board of Education in Philadelphia." He emphasizes the independence that emanates from her deep religious conviction, her disciplined but sometimes vitriolic approach, and, above all, her belief that ghetto children can be taught to read well.

What Gold seems to like best about representing PWRO is that "they call the shots" and are "using a lawyer as the shotgun." In other words, the issue is not who pays for the professional service but the obligation of the professional to serve the interests of a client—as those interests are defined by the client.

In the PWRO action, the development of a "good" case was and is partly the result of a good counsel-client relationship, one that thrives on an occasional phone-slaming session. There is a skilled, dedicated professional and an independent, determined client whose inability to pay for legal services is irrelevant to both. Gold is the first to concede that PWRO's refusal to compromise its educational goals helped his clients to achieve more than anyone originally expected.

The Title I Evaluation and Review Committee. In describing the Title I Evaluation and Review Committee, Steve Gold emphasizes that it was the positive aspect of the court

order of 1973. What had been achieved by the injunction was "largely a negative thing, a brake." PWRO goals, however, included some new programs, especially intensive teaching of math and reading to those poor children who were performing especially badly. However, a welfare rights group was, as Gold puts it, "not in a position to propose programs" to a school system nor to evaluate its existing Title I projects. Instead, the plaintiffs agreed to a compromise: that Title I funds not be allocated until the Philadelphia school district met the statutory requirements in a manner suggested and approved by a committee of three members chosen for their expertise in elementary and secondary education or compensatory education.⁸ As PWRO describes it, "According to the Court Order, the School District of Philadelphia must follow the Title I Committee's recommendations in order to get Title I money from the state."⁹

Both Gold and his clients admit that they had reservations about their compromise. The defendants were to have a veto regarding the choice of the chairman of the three-person committee, but once the state officials agreed on that person he would be his own man. Nonetheless, PWRO was wary. Its leaders did not know whether the educators would support the position of a welfare rights group, regardless of the legal and academic issues, or whether as professionals they would uphold their colleagues in the public schools. Yet, unless the recommendations of the Title I Committee agreed with those of PWRO, the lawsuit would have been in vain. The committee seemed the only opportunity to turn the legal victory into an educational one, but it was by no means a sure one.

Selected to be on the Title I Committee were three distinguished educators. The chairman, Edmund W. Gordon of Teachers College, Columbia University, is an expert on compensatory education and evaluative research. The other two members of the committee were Professors Edgar Epps and Roderick Hilsinger of the Schools of Education at the University of Chicago and Temple University, respectively. The three professors were subjected to severe pressure from local school officials, PWRO, and, to a lesser extent, the Philadelphia teachers union and parents groups.

Although the basic legal issues in the case had been decided without Philadelphia officials (for PWRO had sued the state, not Philadelphia), the local officials nonetheless did their best to block implementation of the court order through stalling and putting pressure on the Title I Committee. For the local authorities would lose the leverage that controlling Title I funds had given them if those funds were used as PWRO wanted them to be. Certain of the Title I Committee's recommendations were also resisted by the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers, which feared some job loss. Yet PWRO people feel that the powerful union was essentially neutral. Evidently the union did not feel threatened by decisions that required more math and reading specialists than art and music teachers. The neutrality of powerful third parties like a teachers' union is a political asset that cannot be underestimated in a struggle such as this.

"Elements in the community," mostly people who were either involved in programs that were evaluated negatively by

the committee or had children in them, also objected to some of the professors' decisions.¹⁰ Their resistance, too, was not formidable or widespread.

PWRO leaders and their attorneys feel that the panel of professors was a sincere one that ultimately judged programs by their compatibility with Title I regulations and children's educational needs. Not one to yield easily herself, Ms. Sanders recalls sympathetically that Title I Committee Chairman Gordon expressed the feeling that "at times he felt so pressured by the board as he tried to fulfill his responsibility that he almost wanted to stop."

Although the Title I Committee backed down at one point, when the school board and its allies balked at terminating programs in midyear, the three professors recommended that Title I funds be spent much as PWRO proposed. Assisted by expert consultants, the Title I Committee concluded that such nonessential programs as Art Specialists Teachers, Computer Assisted Instruction, and Cultural Experience be discontinued.

The committee held that in planning future Title I programs "the highest priority should be given to mastery of basic communicative and cognitive skills."¹¹ There were, said the committee, six program categories that should be adequately supported before Title I monies were allocated for other activities. Two of them were reading and math at the elementary and secondary levels and a special program for fourth, fifth, and sixth graders who fall below the sixteenth percentile in reading and math scores.

The recommendations of the three professors were based on their interpretations of a federal court order and a federal law. However, to determine what children have "the greatest need for assistance" and what types of intervention meet these needs most effectively is a professional judgment, one about which there can be honest disagreement as well as disinterested dissent. In overruling their peers in the school system, the professors were not necessarily right nor partial to PWRO. They were exercising independent, professional judgment.

Legal Action and Staying Power

PWRO later observed that despite the favorable court order and the recommendations of the Title I Committee, "The Fight was not over."¹² The school board carried out some of the recommendations but failed to comply in important respects. For example, it did not develop a conceptually consistent reading program for elementary school students or a specially designed math program for students functioning below the sixteenth percentile.

At issue in this final showdown between PWRO and the school establishment in Philadelphia were not only the merits of PWRO's legal case but also the willingness of a grass-roots group to take unpopular and unpleasant steps to enforce a federal court order. At stake in any struggle between an entrenched government bureaucracy and a self-help organization is what Gold calls "the staying power of community groups." The school system, he points out, "was depending on its [PWRO] dying out." Gold feels that PWRO persisted largely because of Viola Sanders' charismatic, dogged leadership.

Torn between compromise and an all-out struggle, PWRO accepted Ms. Sanders' position that "Our kids are losers now."¹³ Without the reading and math programs for the children needing them most, PWRO's victory was meaningless. "Someone," stresses attorney Gold, "had to stand up to the system." It was particularly important for PWRO to remain steadfast, for as one observer of Title I programs concludes, "Local school districts are virtually free to set their own priorities."¹⁴ PWRO's action in Philadelphia was a major exception to this nationwide pattern.

PWRO returned to court and asked that \$30 million be denied the school system and placed in the control of an independent receiver. It did so knowing that children would get less from Title I funds and would be deprived of some nonessential programs they probably enjoyed. Moreover, by standing up to the board, PWRO could be blamed for causing major disruptions in the entire school system, which claimed it would be unable to meet its payroll unless Title I funds were released by the state.

PWRO's tactics paid off. The combination of the school board's recalcitrance and PWRO's staying power led to a final settlement that exceeded the group's initial demands. As Steve Gold points out, "Our ante kept going up." Each time the board balked, PWRO asked for more new teachers, reading programs, clothing allowances, subway tokens, or free breakfasts. Whereas the suit involved about \$12 million in 1973, when the plaintiffs first went to court, more than twice that amount was at stake in 1975.

Although PWRO declares to its constituents that it won a victory, its leaders feel that their educational goals will not be achieved until the reading and math scores of Title I children really improve. It is not enough to have forced the school system to discontinue the nonessential Title I projects. Nor is it sufficient to have made the board inaugurate special programs in basic instruction for the low-income children who achieve most poorly. For PWRO, quality education requires a measure of community control but above all implies effective educational performance by ghetto children.

Aspira and Bilingual Education

Aspira of New York is another self-help organization that took the schools to court. In contrast to the Philadelphia protesters, whose program focuses mainly on welfare rights, Aspira is largely education oriented. It encourages high school graduation, college attendance, and career mobility through educational counseling and peer work in clubs. High school is the earliest entry point in the Aspira process, but because so many Puerto Ricans, at whom Aspira's work is directed, drop out before even reaching secondary school, Aspira feels impelled to take responsibility for the quality of earlier education. Aspira holds that the failure of the school system to provide bilingual education for Hispanics who have difficulty comprehending English is a major cause of school failure, early withdrawal, and economic marginality.

Like PWRO, Aspira attempted first to achieve its educational goals by means of conventional organizational strategies. Aware that the schools were not taking advantage of avail-

able federal funds for bilingual education (provided by Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act), Aspira, along with other Puerto Rican organizations, tried to work through the State legislature. Although prohibited from lobbying by its tax-exempt status, Aspira encouraged and supported the efforts of several legislators to pass bilingual education bills. Several bills were, in fact, ratified in the early seventies, but mandatory legislation—requiring rather than promoting or recommending bilingual instruction—was blocked, reportedly by lobbyists of the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), which feared job loss for its largely monolingual membership. Concluding that mandatory legislation was necessary and impossible to get, Aspira went to court.

In September 1972, Aspira initiated a class action on behalf of educationally disadvantaged children. It eventually obtained a consent decree requiring the school system to develop programs to meet the needs of these children. Although the Aspira action called for bilingual instruction, Aspira's primary goal, like PWRO's is to have educationally handicapped youth acquire basic academic skills.

The Aspira Consent Decree

The consent decree is an agreement between Aspira and the Board of Education of the City of New York.¹⁵ It was filed in August 1974 by the United States District Court Judge Marvin E. Frankel. The decree stated that by September 1975 the school system had to offer a bilingual program to all Spanish-speaking and Spanish-surnamed public school children whose English language deficiency prevented them from effectively participating in the learning process and who could more effectively participate in Spanish. The program was to include the following planned and systematic components: instruction designed to develop pupils' ability to speak, understand, read, and write English; instruction in Spanish for basic courses—mathematics, science, and social studies; and reinforcement of pupils' use of Spanish.

In a memorandum accompanying the consent decree, Judge Frankel made it clear that Aspira's suit was aided by the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court in a case involving bilingual education of Chinese children in California. "If the governing principles were doubtful when the Aspira case began," he observed, "they became clearer... when the Supreme Court... announced its decision in *Lau v Nichols*..."¹⁶ "Resting its decision solely upon the Civil Rights Act of 1964...." Frankel wrote, "the court rules that the public school authorities receiving pertinent forms of federal aid must act to make the advantages and privileges of their instructional programs... meaningfully available to students who come to the schools unable to understand English." As in the PWRO case, the court ruled that in accepting federal funds for educating disadvantaged children, the schools incur an obligation to provide effective education for these pupils.

The Elements of Class Action

Class action on behalf of educationally disadvantaged Puerto Ricans in New York required some of the same organizational and professional resources that were mobilized on behalf of such children in Philadelphia. Professional educators needed to

document educational failure and to place their imprimatur on proffered solutions. Legal aid was, of course, a requisite. And once again, class action required organizational strengths.

Educational resources. Unlike PWRO leaders, who are volunteers and community people, Aspira staff are professionals involved directly in the educational process. Already keenly aware that many students leave school before they are old enough to be in the Aspira programs, Aspira commissioned two studies to document the problems of Puerto Ricans in the public schools.

Both studies sponsored by Aspira called attention to the Puerto Rican dropout problem, to reading deficiencies, and to the promise of bilingual education. In his 1968 report, *The Losers*, Richard Margolis pointed out that Puerto Ricans in New York City comprised more than one-fifth of the total public school enrollment but less than one-eighth of the academic high school population.¹⁷ His conclusion was no surprise to Aspira but lent professional credibility to its case against the schools: "Plainly a lot of Puerto Rican elementary students are disappearing before they reach high school." Taking exception to the traditional approach to the language barrier—"submerging Spanish in a torrent of English"—Margolis cited some impressionistic evidence to support the conclusion that "it may be easier and more profitable in the long run to change the school's language instead of the child's."¹⁸

Three years later, G. Ramsey Liem arrived at similar conclusions in a paper also prepared for Aspira. Analyzing reading scores in the city's public schools, Liem showed that those with a heavy percentage of black and Puerto Rican students had lower reading levels than white schools, and he also presented data showing a close relationship between high attrition rates and minority status.¹⁹ Liem's examination of school programs led him to conclude that "New York City public schools have been especially slow in recognizing the need for system-wide bilingual education for its large number of non-English-speaking students."²⁰

Along with the studies for which it is responsible, Aspira promulgates data from an authoritative report on schools in New York State, the "Fleischman Report." Clearly supportive of Aspira's case for bilingual education were the following findings of the report: at least 160,000 of the city's approximately 250,000 Puerto Rican school children have significant difficulty in comprehending English; this handicap impedes successful school performance; bilingual education is "the better method for reaching large numbers of children with limited English-speaking ability..."; and "New York City has made no discernible commitment to expand programs for children with English language difficulties...."²¹

Legal aid. The substantial amounts of legal aid that Aspira required in its court battle were given by lawyers from the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund, which has a Puerto Rican dominated board but gets its money from leading foundations and corporations. In a recent Annual Report the fund gave some indication of the vast amount of legal work that class action suits like Aspira require. After describing the key elements of the consent decree, the Annual Report detailed the ongoing, onerous task of "converting it into an educational

reality."²² In the first full semester of implementation alone, "many hundreds of attorney hours" were required.

Class action and community organization. Even when it becomes necessary to take legal action, community organization remains a vital part of educational reform. For the staff of a self-help organization like Aspira, legal action has meant no diminution of community action. Indeed, even those responsible for the legal work, Aspira's attorneys, emphasize that "community organization" is "a key to effective implementation." It is true that the "governing principles" or fundamental legal issues in the *Aspira* case were clarified by the Supreme Court decision in *Lau v. Nichols*, but inasmuch as no specific relief was sought in the *Lau* case, many questions remained. In the Philadelphia case too, implementation was more complicated than proving injury. In a memorandum accompanying the Aspira Consent Decree, Judge Frankel observed that "the open-ended subjects we confronted in this case called for some practical and prudential assessments traditionally associated more with the 'political' than with the judicial specialties." Among these were questions as to how to identify and classify the students and the forms of instruction suited to the task the court was setting the schools. These were precisely the issues that confounded the implementation of the Title I ruling in Philadelphia and for which more than legal action was required.

Although it can, because of its professional leadership, be more authoritative about educational matters than PWRO, Aspira requires community support to achieve its educational goals. It would have been possible for the organization to submit a plan for bilingual instruction and to cite its own studies and other research to show that such a program would be effective. However, members of the injured class or their representatives would not necessarily agree, particularly since the subjects are, as Judge Frankel observed, "open-ended" and the evidence by no means conclusive. Moreover, even if the court could be persuaded to accept an educationally sound plan that lacked community backing, reforms would not necessarily be realized. In this case, since participation in special programs like bilingual classes is voluntary in New York City schools, an unpopular ruling does not necessarily risk the kind of massive disorder that has made it impossible to enforce court-ordered school busing in Boston.²³ If less disruptive, however, the results might be no less disappointing to the advocates of quality education, for in choosing not to participate, the injured parties would remain unrelieved.

One program administrator for Aspira uses the phrase, "a real miracle," to describe "the ability of this agency to get people of opposing viewpoints in the Puerto Rican community to agree on this one thing." Aspira, she says, "touched bases with everyone, with people from every realm of education"—daycare people, paraprofessionals, community school board members, grass-roots leaders. All were told that Aspira was initiating a suit and asked to participate in planning a bilingual program.

Aspira claims that, regardless of differences in other areas, most Puerto Rican organizations and community groups support the consent decree. It is true that some Puerto Rican

parents—1400 in one district and 800 in another—have withdrawn their children from bilingual classes. However, these people are in close touch with Aspira through its Parent Training Institute and are said to have withdrawn their children because bilingual programs in those schools are poorly staffed, planned, and funded. Indicating that Aspira does not regard these withdrawals as defections, one member of its staff says, "If I had a kid in one of those programs I would have pulled him out too."

If the withdrawal of educationally disadvantaged Puerto Rican children does not necessarily connote opposition to the consent decree, the same cannot be said of other Hispanics who refuse to participate. Whereas PWRO represents an income class, the Aspira suit was on behalf of a foreign-language group that is mixed in national origin and income. Resistance to the consent decree has been strongest in the borough of Queens, a part of the city where Aspira does not have programs and where the non-Puerto Rican Hispanic population is concentrated. Although the decree requires that students "spend maximum time with other children so as to avoid isolation and segregation from their peers," Queens Hispanic parents are said to feel that once assigned to bilingual programs, their children will remain permanently segregated. As one member of a dissenting local board stated, "We want our children in the mainstream as soon as possible."²⁴ Reportedly, these parents want their children taught in English, and hundreds of them are said to have rallied to tell that to a community school board.²⁵

It is perhaps inevitable that some members of a class will either define themselves differently from those who take legal action on their behalf or resist the forms of relief that are fashioned for them. This seems particularly true of the Aspira action, since the injured class is of necessity heterogeneous and Aspira's services are addressed to a large segment of that group but not to all of it. However, had it involved them in planning the class action, Aspira might have convinced more non-Puerto Rican Hispanics that bilingualism will help their children learn English better.

In any case, the resistance of Hispanics not served by Aspira underscores the importance of community organization for class action, for these defections have probably abetted the central school board's delay in implementing the consent decree. It is true that the chancellor of schools superseded a recalcitrant local school board in Queens, and Judge Frankel denied its petition to intervene in the suit.²⁶ However, at a time when Aspira has asked the court to cite the central school authorities for contempt on the grounds that bilingual programs are way behind schedule, the action of the dilatory district board could divert attention from the noncompliance of city officials.²⁷ Moreover, local resistance enables the central board, if it wishes, to attribute delay to the noncompliance of community groups. Regardless of the outcome of the contempt proceedings, opposition from some segments of the injured class may have impaired the implementation of the court order. Were low-income Puerto Ricans less solidly behind the self-help organization, bilingualism would be even more beleaguered.

Quality Bilingual Education

All quality education depends on good teachers, but quality bilingual programs present an especially severe staffing challenge. If Philadelphia's Title I children are to master basic cognitive skills, they must have effective teachers in their special reading and math programs. Quality bilingual instruction, however, requires teachers who are not only effective as teachers but also competent in two languages.

Since full implementation of the consent decree involves bilingual instruction for about 85,000 of New York's public school children, the consent decree could be a threat to the jobs of the system's monolingual teachers. Discouraging participation by eligible children is one way to minimize job loss, and it was employed by the superseded community school board, which violated consent decree regulations by requiring prior parental consent.²⁸ Turning monolingual teachers into bilingual teachers is another way. Instead of assigning licensed Spanish bilingual staff to all Aspira programs, the board, no doubt with union support, has chosen to protect monolingual staff by offering an ancillary certificate to teachers who successfully complete a crash program in Spanish and pass a special examination.

At this writing the Board of Education of the City of New York has assigned less than one-third of the estimated 1500 teachers necessary for full implementation of the consent decree. Thus while only a few hundred participating teachers now hold the ancillary certificate, such an expedient might well be used on a large scale. Preferring to get bilingual programs underway, Aspira has chosen not to contest the use of teachers whose crash course hardly equips them to teach science or social studies in Spanish.

The discussion of PWRO showed how the near neutrality of the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers aided the cause of a self-help organization. It is understandable that Aspira would want to avoid a confrontation with a formidable foe like the United Federation of Teachers. However, Aspira could find itself in the difficult position of accepting substantial numbers of crash-trained teachers, thereby risking educational goals, or of insisting on bilingual competence, thereby incurring opposition that could seriously impede implementation.

Harlem Parents Union

According to its chairwoman, Babette Edwards, Harlem Parents Union is an "outgrowth of the demolished I.S. 201 demonstration project," which, in turn, was an outgrowth of the earlier defeat of school integration in New York. "Bloody but unbowed" by its bitter battles with the Board of Education of the City of New York, the leaders of the Harlem Parents Union are groping for still another strategy, a new way to secure quality education for black and Hispanic children.

The goal of the Harlem activists is the same as it has always been, and it is no different from the objectives of New York Aspira and Philadelphia Welfare Rights. However, the present strategy of the Harlem protesters differs from their own earlier approaches and from the current thrusts of the two other organizations featured here. Having concluded that neither integrated education nor "quality segregated education" is pre-

sently possible within the New York City system, the members of the Harlem Parents Union are trying to acquire alternative education for their children. Lacking the money to purchase good private education, they are demanding that the state education department issue to parents a voucher or cash grant equal to the amount of public funds currently spent to provide a minority child with an inferior public service. "This voucher," explains Babette Edwards, "can be used by the parent to pay for educational services from an educational source of one's choice..., such as professionally qualified tutors, schools away from home, community formed and operated schools, alternative schools, independent schools, etc."²⁹

Defeat of Decentralized Community Control

I first encountered Babette Edwards ten years ago when she and other parent activists were forging another new and dramatic school strategy. When it became clear that Intermediate School 201, a new middle school, would be built too deep within the Harlem ghetto to permit integration, these activists protested the choice of the site.³⁰ Defeated in their efforts to have the school erected in a border area where integration would be more feasible, the I.S. 201 group demanded that the new segregated school be community controlled. If they could not have the quality integrated education they preferred, they would try instead to get quality segregated education, which implied that community residents have some say about the choice of key school staff and curricula. In a step that angered many former white liberal allies, they called for the resignation of the slated white principal of I.S. 201 and for the appointment of a principal of their own choosing, a qualified black.

In response to this organized pressure, the central school board agreed to establish three widely dispersed demonstration projects to test decentralized community control: I.S. 201 in Harlem, Ocean-Hill Brownsville in Brooklyn, and Two Bridges in Lower Manhattan.³¹ Many observers agree with Babette Edwards' assessment that "union [UTF] and other status quo forces moved against the demonstration projects and thoroughly diluted any proposed decentralization that would give any authority to local parents. Parents," Ms. Edwards relates, "were given the illusion of some sort of control or power. There were," she recalls, "high expectations and then there was depression and letdown because expectations were not fulfilled."

The Harlem Parents Union "was founded in the wake of the decentralization defeat." Arguing that "everyone else in the system is protected by contract with the central board" but that nobody is protecting the ones the system is supposed to serve, the I.S. 201 activists formed a union of parents.³²

Harlem Parents Union attempts to inform parents of their rights and to enable them to protect their children. Although its chief goal is school reform, the parents union, like other protest groups, provides substantial services to individuals. There is a tutoring program for 180 children and assistance to community residents on problems ranging from school suspension to welfare. As Babette Edwards says, "We need a multi-service program for a multi-problem community." The organization recently received a government grant for the tutorial

program, but Ms. Edwards insists that community action preceded the funded services and will continue regardless of financial support. In this respect the Harlem group is as free as PWRO and similarly outspoken.

Action for Alternative Education

Early in 1975, members of the parents union began to press for education vouchers as an alternative to poor public schooling. In a letter to State Commissioner of Education Ewald Nyquist, Babette Edwards protested "massive unconcern" and "silence from our public servants," despite published reports that 87 percent of the students in central Harlem had recently scored below grade level on standardized achievement tests in reading and math.³³

Declaring that "the entire school system has demonstrated bad faith toward our communities for far too long" and that "only individual interested parents can be trusted to show a disinterested concern for the education of their children," Ms. Edwards called upon the state to inaugurate a voucher system. "We believe that the money allotted for a child's attendance in a school which is failing should be withdrawn from the school—on parental request—and given to the parent, either in cash or voucher, to purchase alternative education." Black and Puerto Rican children, it was argued, "are entitled, as citizens, to receive beneficial treatment in our state institutions to justify the time and freedom they give up for compulsory education." If the state did not meet its obligations to their children by providing alternatives to damaging public schooling, the Harlem parents threatened to go to court to obtain their rights.

Having received no response from state authorities by the beginning of the next term, some members of the Harlem Parents Union took the serious step of withdrawing their children from the schools to which they had been assigned for the 1975-76 school year. As Babette Edwards wrote to Commissioner Nyquist, "A lot of thinking and soul-searching went into the parents' decision to withdraw their children from our local schools and to suffer whatever consequences may come about."³⁴ Parents knew that for violating compulsory attendance laws they could be charged with neglect in family court and that their children could even be taken away from them.

The protesting parents are not acting without legal precedent. They are aware that in 1958 two Harlem parents were taken to the domestic relations court (now family court) because they refused to send their children to school.³⁵ The case was heard by Judge Justine Wise Polier who held that the parents would indeed have been guilty of neglect had they permitted their children to attend the inferior schools from which they had been withdrawn. As the following statement of Babette Edwards suggests, the present withdrawal from Harlem schools is influenced by the earlier one and by the Polier ruling:

This representative group of parents has withdrawn their children from the inferior schools to which they have been callously assigned for the 1975-1976 school year. They take this step as the only means open to them to protect their children from the awful consequences of delib-

erate miseducation. To do otherwise would constitute an act of negligence on their part.¹⁶

Judge Polier's 1959 decision was never appealed by the New York City Board of Education. Instead the children were quietly transferred to better schools.

In response to the present withdrawal of children from Harlem schools, officials of the board of education are also offering parents a choice of alternative schools. But, as Ms. Edwards says bluntly, "It is a choice between gonorrhea and syphilis." For example, a local superintendent offered one of the children four alternatives—three in which failure rates were similar to or higher than those in his former school and one yet unopened school that gave no more promise. The youth attended a school which ranked 126 out of the city's 168 intermediate schools in reading achievement. The alternative schools ranked 102, 144, 168.

Having been told by school officials that present laws do not permit the state to fund vouchers, Harlem Parents Union will probably join the other self-help organizations that have taken legal action. Presumably, lawyers representing the parents union would try to prove that the school system denies black and Hispanic children their right to an effective education. And they would demand education vouchers as a form of relief.

The Strategies Reconsidered

For more than twenty years, advocates of quality education have been going to court to prove that separate education is inherently unequal and to relieve educational disadvantage by means of school integration. Each of the self-help groups studied here shares the goal of earlier reforms. Each believes that quality education remains essential to occupational and economic mobility. But none insists that education be integrated in order to achieve these goals. Spokesmen for PWRO, Aspira, and Harlem Parents Union are neither consciously separatist nor even overtly nationalist. Nonetheless, the rhetoric of integration is conspicuously absent from their current rationales.

For some school reformers integration is the "road not taken." But unlike Frost's path, it seemed preferable but forbidden to some travelers and perhaps forgotten by those who wanted to keep moving, even along a detour that is less desirable. Although less fair and by no means free of barriers, the alternative route appears to have an important advantage. The school establishment—the boards, bureaucracies, and teachers unions—still want to direct traffic on this route and may well succeed in doing so when its basic interests are threatened. Yet other powerful groups are indifferent. Thus while busing in Boston greatly offends whites, many of whom have mobilized to oppose it, bilingual instruction in New York and Title I allocations in Philadelphia are relatively unimportant issues outside the minority communities.

The three organizations featured in this article are variously positioned along the alternative route. In Philadelphia, where seven years of litigation have produced only a modest plan for school busing, PWRO has demanded that money and educational programs be concentrated in schools with low-income families and on children who are particularly low-

achieving. It has not concerned itself with having these children educated in more affluent neighborhoods or in integrated schools. To some extent PWRO's route has been mapped out by Title I which, to use social policy parlance, is a selective program. It is not a universal measure for all school children but one earmarked for those who are low-income and educationally disadvantaged.

Aspira strives to reduce the distance between the achievement of Puerto Ricans and that of other groups, but it maintains that bilingual education is the swiftest current into the mainstream. However, some Hispanics who oppose consent decree programs feel that bilingual classes will segregate their children unnecessarily. Interestingly, one report commissioned by Aspira suggests the failure of earlier reforms, notably integration and decentralized community control.¹⁷

Leaders of the Harlem Parents Union are experienced travelers on the non-integrated path. They felt forced to turn away from integration almost ten years ago. Now they appear to doubt whether the New York City school system can offer their children quality segregated education, much less integration. Parents union strategists point out that vouchers could be a boon to the public schools by administering the external stimulus the system needs. In any case, vouchers would enable blacks and Hispanics to establish alternative schools in place of those public institutions that continue to fail. In the past, proponents of vouchers have argued that tuition grants permit parental choice, including integration. However, the parents union plan is pegged to black and Hispanics—not because the intent is separatist but because schools attended by minorities are the ones that are failing.

The present strategy of the Harlem Parents Union may presage future school protest. The ultimate success of both Aspira and PWRO depends upon how well their programs are implemented, particularly staffed, by the school systems in Philadelphia and New York. Should bilingual education fail to achieve its promise, Aspira might well conclude that the fault lies neither with bilingualism nor with Spanish-dominant pupils but rather with the competence of bilingual staff and the commitment of the school bureaucracy. Similarly, if new Title I programs fail to raise math and reading scores appreciably, PWRO may also begin to ask whether Philadelphia public schools are capable of offsetting educational disadvantages. Thus the effective implementation of selective strategies may require changes that affect the basic interests of the school establishment, particularly teachers unions. Whether the latter will be as successful in defying a court order as in thwarting the passage of legislation—e.g., decentralized community control in New York State—remains to be seen. In that case, of course, the union was able to suggest that a school reform affronted other powerful interests, namely the Jewish community.

Integrated Action

Simply because school protest is on behalf of children in segregated schools does not mean that reformers eschew integrated action. The organizations studied here are ghetto-based or minority-led. Yet, all three have needed help from individuals and groups who are part of the establishment.

PWRO is a welfare rights organization whose leaders

"call the shots" but also recognize that they need people from outside the ghetto—lawyers, educators, social scientists, middle-class activists. Their relationship with Steve Gold, whom they refer to affectionately as "our Steve," is warm, perhaps because it is sometimes heated. Viola Sanders is aware that educational change required the professors, who, withstanding the pressure of their peers, evaluated Title I programs on their merits for disadvantaged children. And she also credits the middle-class Friends of Welfare with valuable assistance on several occasions. PWRO leaders feel that the issue of welfare rights goes "hand in hand" with the essentially white, middle-class peace movement, which, like welfare rights organizations, appears to be surviving the seventies better in Philadelphia than elsewhere. Referring to PWRO's joint activities with the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, Chairwoman Brookins says, "It was a joy to be involved."

Babette Edwards, the dedicated leader of the Harlem Parents Union, includes among her heroes community people like Hannah Brockington as well as a white professional like sociologist Annie Stein. Stein, who gives workshops for the parents union on such subjects as reading scores and the history of public education, is, says Edwards, "always there when you need her." Annie Stein has written that "the role of the 'honest' educator and social scientist must be to give whatever help he can to those in the front lines...." Those in the "front lines," gifted community leaders like Babette Edwards and Viola Sanders, are deeply appreciative of the help they get from honest professionals like Annie Stein and Steve Gold.

Although Aspira is directed by Puerto Rican professionals, achievement of its consent decree was aided by "others"—non-Puerto Ricans who helped develop the rationale for bilingual education, to argue the case for it in court, and to pay for the extensive legal services it required. In short, defeats for integration need not end majority and middle-class support of quality education for minorities. Some white and black professionals continue to offer their services to low-income minorities and continue to find their expertise esteemed.

Legal Action and Community Organization

Emphasizing that self-help organizations need professional expertise and outside support in their struggle for quality educa-

tion should not obscure the fact that traditional organizational strengths are important, even when legal strategies are stressed. This study shows that securing quality education through the courts requires more than legal resources. Before even going to court, educational reformers must organize, involve, and gain the sanction of the injured class as well as assemble some individual plaintiffs and obtain the necessary legal aid. Organizing class action presents a particular challenge to the Harlem Parents Union because its protesting parents are incurring considerable risks to initiate legal action with the schools. And such parents need the support and spokespersonship of a strong organization.

This report indicates that positive action, the implementation of a court order, may require more organizational resources than initiating a suit and getting the court to agree that school officials have violated the law. Whether self-help organizations can prevail in a contest with school bureaucracies seems to hinge on some political factors, particularly the staying power of a community group and the extent to which it commands the loyalty of the class for whom relief is sought. In the Aspira case, the particular form of relief does not appeal to part of the injured class. This is to some extent unavoidable, given Aspira's target group, which is Puerto Ricans, but perhaps problems could have been diminished had Aspira done more to involve other Hispanics in the planning of bilingual programs.

In Philadelphia, the tenacity and independence of grassroots leaders were important, as was the fact that most members of the injured class made no effort to prevent PWRO from holding out against the school board. Apathy or the lack of an organized opposition in the ghetto may account for the absence of defections, but lower-class Philadelphians may also have felt well represented by PWRO.

This report strongly suggests that legal action for better schools does not obviate the need for organizational resources and skilled community organization. If the children of the poor are to have quality education, they will need advocates outside the ghetto, but they will also need an organized community.

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgement in professional matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Center for Policy Research, Inc., New York, New York, for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Center for Policy Research, Inc. or the National Institute of Education.

NOTES

1. Cybernation, along with radical changes in the development of weaponry and human rights, are said to constitute a Triple Revolution. According to the Ad Hoc Committee on the Triple Revolution, a group of economists, educators, writers, and others, these changes, particularly cybernation, were breaking the traditional link between jobs and income. Hence the Triple Revolution necessitated a guaranteed adequate annual income. See John D. Promfret, "Guaranteed Income Asked for All, Employed or Not," *New York Times*, March 23, 1964.
2. For background information about this law, see Stephen K. Bailey and Edith K. Mosher, *ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968).
3. Education Committee, Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization, *Education Manual* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization, 1975), introductory letter.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

5. Tom Parmenter, "Power to the People Through Title I? Maybe," *Inequality in Education* 6 (November 1970): 1-8.
6. *Nicholson v. Pittenger*, 364 F. Supp. 669 (E.D. Pa., 1973).
7. For a discussion of the background, including the vicissitudes, of federally funded legal services to the poor, see John R. Conyers, Jr., "Undermining Poverty Lawyers," *Verdicts on Lawyers*, Ed. Ralph Nader and Mark Green. (New York: Crowell, 1976), pp. 129-43.
8. *Report of the Philadelphia School District Title I Evaluation and Review Committee, 1973/74 Academic School Year* (New York: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1974).
9. *Education Manual*, p. 9.
10. *Report of the Title I Committee*, p. 9.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 80. See Also pp. 83-91.
12. *Education Manual*, p. 11.
13. "Kids are Losers, WRO Exec Says," *Philadelphia Daily News*, 18 March 1975.
14. Jerome T. Murphy, "Title I: Bureaucratic Politics and Poverty Politics," *Inequality in Education* 6 (November 1970): 14.
15. *Aspira of New York, Inc. v. Board of Education of the City of New York*, 72 Civ. 4002 (S.D. N.Y., 1974).
16. *Lau v. Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).
17. Richard J. Margolis, *The Losers: A Report on Puerto Ricans and the Public Schools* (New York: Aspira, Inc., 1968), p. 4.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
19. G. Ramszy Liem, "...and Others": *A Report Card for the New York City Public Schools*, presented at the Education Action Conference, sponsored by the New York Community Training Institute, Aspira, Inc., and the Community Development Agency, Asbury Park, New Jersey, 9 January 1971 (New York: Aspira, Inc., undated), especially pp. 1-17.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
21. New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education Report, 2 vols. (New York: Viking, 1972), cited in *Aspira of New York, Background Information on Puerto Ricans in New York*, undated.
22. The Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc., *Annual Report 1974-1975*, p. 5.
23. Establishing bilingual classes is mandatory for the Board of Education, but parents may choose not to have their children participate.
24. See Deborah Orin, "Bilingual Education Stand Puts CSB 30 on the Carpet," *Long Island Press*, 28 January 1976.
25. See Deborah Orin, "District 30 to Fight Takeover by Board of Ed," *Long Island Press*, 6 February 1976.
26. *Aspira of New York, Inc. v. Board of Education of New York*, 72 Civ. 4002 (S.D.N.Y., 1976).

continued next page

IRCD Bulletin

Published quarterly by the Institute for Urban and Minority Education. Subscription rate: \$4.00 per year. Back issues: 1-9 copies, \$1.00 each; 10-24 copies, \$0.80 each; 25-49 copies, \$0.60 each; 50 copies and over, \$0.50 each.

Edmund W. Gordon, Editor

Send all communications to: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027. The Institute for Urban and Minority Education is an agency for human resource development and school organization improvement in the nation's cities. Founded in 1973, the Institute is sponsored by Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

IRCD Bulletin

Subscription Notice

The **IRCD Bulletin** is published quarterly on a calendar year basis. The cost of a subscription is \$4.00 per year (four issues). In order to subscribe, please complete the form below and send it with your check or money order for \$4.00 to:

**Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Box 40
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027**

Subscriptions must be prepaid. Please make check or money order payable to Teachers College. Subscriptions are accepted for complete calendar year volumes only.

Please enter my subscription to the **IRCD Bulletin**. Enclosed is \$4.00. I understand that I will receive four issues.

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip Code _____

Please check one of the following categories which best describes your affiliation:

- ☐ College or University
- ☐ Elementary or Secondary School/System
- ☐ Government Agency
- ☐ Library or Information Center
- ☐ Public or Private Agency
- ☐ Other (Please specify) _____

27. Aspira is charging that none of the city's 32 community school districts has a bilingual program for all eligible students. See David Vidal, "Court Gets Case on Bilingualism: Aspira Says City Is Failing to Provide Programs," *New York Times*, 22 February 1976.
28. According to regulations agreed to by Aspira and the central board, parents are notified after children are assigned to bilingual programs and can withdraw them if they choose to do so.
29. E. Babette Edwards, "Education Vouchers for Blacks and Hispanics," Statement to the New York State Board of Regents, at the Regents Legislative Conference, 10 September 1975.
30. For a treatment of the controversy at I.S. 201, see the author's "I.S. 201: An Educational Landmark," *IRCD Bulletin* 2 and 3 (Winter 1966-1967).
31. For a treatment of decentralization, see Annie Stein, "Strategies for Failure," *Harvard Educational Review* 41 (May 1971): 171-77.
32. The idea of a parents union or of a group to represent the interests of children as forcefully as unions represent teachers seems to be a growing concept. For example, there is a Parents Union for Public Schools in Philadelphia. Interestingly, it is suing the city school board for illegally delegating part of its policy-making authority to the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers by allowing the federation to share decision-making power with the board in several important areas of school policy.
33. E. Babette Edwards to Ewald B. Nyquist, 10 February 1975.
34. Edwards to Nyquist, 20 October 1975.
35. See Leonard Buder, "2 Harlem Schools Called Inferior as Court Frees 2 in Boycott," *New York Times*, 16 December 1958.
36. Edwards to Irving Anker, 28 November 1975. Irving Anker is Chancellor of the Board of Education of the City of New York.
37. See Liem, pp. 103-105.

CALL FOR DOCUMENTS

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, under the auspices of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, is constantly seeking documents for inclusion in the ERIC information storage and retrieval system. Teachers, administrators, researchers, and others are invited to submit research reports, program evaluations, instructional materials, bibliographies, surveys, conference papers and proceedings which deal with the education of urban and minority populations. Two copies of appropriate documents should be sent to:

ERIC/CUE

Box 40

**Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027**

Copies should be clearly printed and accompanied by an abstract, if possible.

* * *

IRCD BULLETIN

Edmund W. Gordon, Editor

Teachers College, Columbia University
Box 40

525 West 120th Street
New York, New York 10027

Volume XI, Number 2

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

Non-Profit Org. U.S. Postage PAID New York, N.Y. Permit No. 5578
